DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 738 TM 800 233

AUTHOR Prentice, Barbara S.; Richardson, Denise R.
TITLE Results of Survey Questionnaire for AERA Division H: School Evaluation and Program Development Fostering Fruitful University/LEA Relations.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (64th, Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Educational Researchers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Participant Characteristics; Research and Development Centers; *Research Directors; *Research Needs; *Research Problems; *School Districts; *Schools of Education
IDENTIFIERS American Educational Research Association

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to identify problems associated with cooperative research projects between universities and local education agencies (school districts); personal and organizational census data were also collected. Sixty-seven research directors from large city schools, 59 researchers in local agencies, and 24 college of education deans responded to the 86-item scaled and open-ended survey. The relationship was characterized by misunderstanding and mutual recrimination about research design and needs. Some benefits were cited, however, such as: closer contact for the university with reality; technical help at reduced cost; credibility of an outside authority; and higher funding of collaborative projects. An organized group of school researchers (Division H of the American Educational Research Association) made recommendations for fostering cooperation between local education agencies and university researchers: early and sincere involvement of both parties; shared decision-making; clearly specified policies and procedures; fund raising; involvement of research journals; and establishment of an awards program. About 100 open-ended survey responses are included; four exemplary projects are briefly described. (CTP0)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187738

RESULTS OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AERA DIVISION H: SCHOOL EVALUATION AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FOSTERING FRUITFUL UNIVERSITY/LEA RELATIONS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Barbara S. Prentice, PhD
Director of Research and Evaluation

Denise R. Richardson
Administrative Intern

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Prentice, Barbara S
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Research and Evaluation
Tucson Unified School District
Tucson, Arizona

TM800 233

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, April 7-11, 1980

We acknowledge the contributions to this research of:

Dr. William Webster, Dallas, Texas, who originated the Division H Task Force

Dr. Walter Hathaway, Chairperson, Portland, Oregon

Contributing Members:

Dr. Stan Adelman, Gary, Indiana

Dr. Stewart Rankin, Detroit, Michigan

Dr. Les Richards, University of Saskatchewan, Canada

Dr. Vivian Todd, Long Beach, California

A Division H Task Force titled "Fostering Fruitful Relationships Between Universities and Local Education Agencies" utilized a questionnaire to provide input for a position paper. The methodology employed, population surveyed, and inclusion of responses to varied questions are included in this paper. That there are differences in perceptions of what is occurring and what should occur in University/Local Education Agency (LEA) relationships is quite apparent from the data. Comments from respondents indicate a rather keen awareness of the problem areas which should be addressed in the position paper.

I. Introduction

As the authors began to review the available literature on the specific subject of University/Local Education Agency research relationships, it became obvious that this subject has been a long-term concern. Several papers focusing on different aspects of the topic have been presented at previous American Educational Research Association (AERA) Conferences. Several are addressing this concern at the 1980 Conference.

In his paper "The Development of a Metropolitan Research Partnership" presented at the 1979 Conference, Michael Kean made this statement:

> Cooperative research and evaluation efforts between local education agencies (LEAs), universities, and educational labs and centers have progressed from being considered an innovation to being viewed as an operational necessity. The research on schools for which 'outside' agencies have long been responsible, and the research in schools practiced by LEA based offices of research and evaluation, have now reached the point where they cannot be conducted separately, if either is to be effective.

Encouraging collaborative efforts between university and research and development centers with LEAs has been discussed at every annual meeting

of Large City Directors of Research and Evaluation (DREs) for the past ten years. This is the special interest group that begat Division H. It is therefore understandable that as part of their commitment to the fostering of fruitful relationships, the Task Force members recommended that the Division H membership should be surveyed on:

a. The nature of University/LEA relationships

b. Problems and issues in relationships

c. Successful joint relationships

The primary focus of the survey was on the research and evaluation relationships between the Universities and the LEAs and inclusion of both scaled and open-ended response modes.

To be able to report that educational research is flourishing and that rapid change is prevalent would seem to indicate a healthy state of affairs. It suggests a rationally ordered system within which research leads to relevant change and in its turn, change serves to stimulate further research. There is, unfortunately, little evidence to support such a favorable diagnosis. Instead of a healthy, productive cooperation between researchers and practitioners, their relationship would seem to be characterized by misunderstanding and a certain amount of mutual recrimination. These words were written by Alfred Yates in 1967. The occasion was an international meeting of experts to study the position of educational research. Assembled at the Unesco Institute, Hamburg, Germany, their main purpose was to:

> Submit to critical scrutiny the present arrangements for organizing and carrying out educational research with a view to discovering ways in which these arrangements might be so modified as to lead to a more fruitful partnership between research and educational practice.

Representing the United States were noted professors Nathaniel L. Gage of Stanford University and Egon G. Guba, Indiana University.

The conference had its origin in a widely shared concern that educational research appeared to be failing the needs of its patrons. Those who sponsored and

those who participated in the conference were committed to the proposition that the justification of educational research must rest on the contribution it can make to the improvement of educational practice.

Our data indicate that the majority of the perceptions have not changed. The relationships are still characterized by "misunderstanding and mutual recrimination." The following are some comments from each of the group memberships surveyed. These comments are in response to the question, *"What are your three most common complaints about University/LEA relationships?"* It is worthy to mention that one of the most recurring complaints from LEA and DRE respondents concerned poorly constructed research designs.

Large City Directors of Research and Evaluation (DREs)*

They have no concept of what is happening in a public school K-12.

Too much dominance in decision-making function by university personnel.

Requests for studies with urgent timelines that do not permit adequate planning and negotiation for change.

Our major problem with universities is that the dissertation proposals which their doctoral candidates submit to us are poorly written and conceived. This puts us in the awkward position of rejecting a proposal for technical/qualitative reasons after a doctoral committee has approved it.

Universities and LEAs don't coordinate joint projects well (partly because of differences in expectations and organizations).

Each group is so concerned about their own problems and operations that little time remains for one another.

Preoccupation of schools of education with very narrow and specialized areas of research.

There is no continuous relationship on which the LEA can depend.

Assumption that the particular research effort planned has priority over instructional needs and the school district should be grateful that the researcher is interested in working in the LEA.

Attempts to circumvent the jointly approved procedures.

*Comments typed as written.

Local Education Agency Personnel (LEAs)*

The University tends towards types of research that are initiated at University levels and reflect that special interest of the individual professor.

University isolates itself. . .

Failure of Universities to understand the practical limitations placed on 'good' research design in the LEA setting.

Advisors who move their graduate students far along a research track without consultation with the school system in which they wish to conduct research.

Lack of direct relevance or applicability of results in the everyday situation.

LEA curriculum planning does not include university research as a viable component.

LEA frequently does not receive final reports or results even though this is always stipulated in the approval. Graduate students doing dissertation research are the worst about sending final report copies.

Lack of personnel in the university setting with relevant experience at the elementary grade levels.

Amount of recordkeeping and followup necessitated by these joint efforts.

Universities concerned with pure research, LEAs concerned with operations research.

Higher Education (University and College)*

Little cooperative efforts.

No policies have been developed for facilitating cooperation.

LEAs often do not realize the benefits of basic or generic research. They want an immediate and guaranteed product.

Universities are often insensitive to public school pressures and requirements for accountability.

Schools are not receptive to open (creative) involvement with university programs/personnel.

University personnel do not see the point of helping LEA personnel to translate pertinent research finding into practical applications.

Failure to inform universities of research needs and/or desires.

*Comments typed as written.

Higher Education (University and College) (contd.)

Contacts based more on what Sieber calls 'patronage ties' rather than on training or expertise.

Unless equal time is given or other demands are met the school districts will not allow professors and their students into the districts to do research.

No respect for local educators shown by reformist graduate students.

Deans of Colleges of Education*

LEA staff is not interested in repeated research.

Convincing LEA faculty that research is important.

Schools do not see need for theoretical research.

Neither recognizes that each has a differing set of expectations about the purposes/benefits of research.

Lack of willingness on both sides to recognize the other's strengths and own weaknesses.

Lack of clearly defined roles of each party.

Uncoordinated and overlapping requests for sites and subjects.

Time requirements of most studies are too costly to LEA in lost instruction time.

Schools get nothing in return for their cooperation.

Failure of the researcher to follow established approval procedures.

We are all aware of the problems and perceptions involved in conducting research when the principal participants are LEAs and Universities. The authors therefore felt that although it was important to note the problems, the Task Force and Division H membership would best be served by including a focus on the following:

1. Why these problems exist
2. What can be done to minimize the problems
3. Benefits that result from the relationships
4. Some successful collaborative efforts

*Comments typed as written.

Why Do the Problems Exist?

Assuming that when a problem is identified, definitive steps can be taken to alleviate it, the authors queried 40 Deans of Colleges of Education. Here are some of the most insightful analyses of the problem:

Questions schools want answered are frequently not researchable questions--more prone toward evaluation.

Each party has a different stake in research, and these different stakes are often in competition.

Different philosophical orientation and need.

Heavy demands are placed upon LEAs within close proximity to the University community.

With a continuing fiscal crush upon schools, the idea of involving staff in outside research is viewed as another burden.

Cooperation is sporadic rather than ongoing.

Lack of procedures and policies in writing.

Inadequate communication.

Many LEAs have been students in higher education who are not supportive of research.

Differences in priorities.

By nature they are both bureaucratic, and thus, it is extremely difficult to maintain bilateral communication at every level.

What Then Can Feasibly Be Done to Foster More Cooperative Relationships Between the Local Education Agency and the University?

In its position paper last year, the Division H Task Force on "Fostering Fruitful Relationships Between Universities and Local Education Agencies" made several recommendations. The Division H membership was asked through this Task Force survey to respond to those recommendations. The results were as follows:

Recommendation 1.

For relationships to work there must be early and sincere involvement of the other partner in planning the effort.

Membership Response

Eighty-six percent of the LEA personnel and 89 percent of the University personnel who responded support this recommendation.

Recommendation 2.

Those that control resources in any relationship and significant holders of other forms of control must share decisionmaking and power with key persons on the other side who are affected by the effort.

Membership Response

Seventy percent of the LEA members and 76 percent of University members who responded support this recommendation.

Recommendation 3.

Communication, expectations, policies, procedures, roles and responsibilities must be clear to all within the boundaries of the system affected and the channels used to generate these forms of information must be open to all affected and, finally, their agreement must be obtained.

Membership Response

Ninety-five percent of the LEA members and 94 percent of University members who responded support this recommendation.

Recommendation 4.

One way to improve general levels of respect, trust and communication between Universities and LEAs is by exchange or sharing of personnel.

Membership Response

Eighty-one percent of the LEA members and 86 percent of the University personnel who responded indicated that this option should be available.

Recommendation 5.

Division H and AERA as a whole should encourage Federal, Private and State funding agencies to allocate significant resources to collaborative University/LEA research efforts and to research on fostering University/LEA relationships.

Membership Response

Over 80 percent of the respondents from both LEA and the University group supported this recommendation.

Recommendation 6.

The Journal Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis should be encouraged to develop a special issue on this subject and to maintain it as an editorial priority.

Membership Response

Eighty-two percent of the LEA Division H members and 65 percent of the University members who responded indicated that research journals should sometimes focus on the issue of University/LEA relationships.

Recommendation 7.

The Division H awards program should include a new category like "Best example of a collaborative University/LEA RD&E effort."

Membership Response

This recommendation is supported by 76 percent of the LEA membership and 75 percent of the University members who responded.

In addition, the respondents from the Division H membership, the Large City Research Directors, and the Deans of Colleges of Education make these recommendations:*

Develop cooperative Data Bases.

Pool knowledge and resources in an attempt to solve metropolitan educational problems.

*Typed as written.

LEAs should compile and make available to the Universities a list of LEA research needs (solicited cooperatives).

Establish specific communication channels.

Communicate to researchers that they are responsible for reporting the results of their studies and the immediate application of those findings for the practitioners involved.

Establish a research department team in LEA that would keep current on educational research, match it with the district's problems, and then translate the research into objectives, activities, etc., for school district personnel.

Set up an advisory committee for Research and Evaluation in schools with both LEA and higher education members.

Develop specific workable procedures for processing research requests.

Consider research, development, dissemination, evaluation, and implementation as parts of Research and Development.

Attacking mutually defined topics and apply the findings systematically.

Construct centers for field services through which to relate answers most useful to LEAs.

Develop policy agreements.

Make assurances that results will have benefits to community or research will not be undertaken.

Use University resources to assist LEAs in seeking external funds.

Encourage research discussions on relevant topics to a district.

Request of schools the areas in which they need assistance and attempt to match these requests with pertinent faculty.

Collaborate to develop guidelines.

Establishment of joint University/LEA policy boards for specific research projects.

Joint sponsorship of legislation (state and national) for Research and Evaluation.

Careful monitoring of proposals at the University level.

Make sure those who cooperate are informed of results in an efficient way.

Have periodic discussions planned between on-line school administration and selected and interested researchers.

Submit joint proposals for funding.

Establish a consortium with public school people to not only deal with research but program development.

Benefits Derived From University/LEA Relationships

All the survey respondents agreed that there are presently some benefits being derived from the collaborative University/LEA relationship. The comments that follow were selected from the Division H respondents, Large City Research Directors of Research and Evaluation, and Deans of Colleges of Education. Some of the most commonly mentioned benefits were:*

Collaborative relationships allow staff and faculty from both groups to begin to understand more completely the needs and potential of the other.

Closer contact with reality.

Research results that are considered valuable.

Satisfaction in solving a mutual academic problem.

Access to target populations.

An opportunity to grow in understanding and knowledge about areas that otherwise would not be touched.

LEA has the opportunity to receive technical help at a reduced cost to the LEA.

LEA has the credibility of an outside authority speaking for them on local matters of emotional concern.

Collaborative projects are often funded at higher levels than either one separately.

It is an opportunity for graduate students to learn to conduct research.

The quality of the research questions improves.

There is often a direct spinoff for improved relationships in other areas.

Successful Joint Relationships

The Division H membership was asked in this survey to list three successful University/LEA cooperatives in which they had engaged within the

*Typed as written.

last three years. Although some respondents indicated that they had none, we were encouraged by the number who responded affirmatively. In addition, a number of the successes did have joint funding. Listed below are an indication of the varying types of joint ventures:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

The College of Education, in cooperation with the Mobile County Public Schools and the Mobile County Mental Health Center, obtained a Teacher Corps contract this past year.

The College of Education, in collaboration with the Clark County Public Schools, obtained an ESAA Student Concerns Project which is in the second year of operation.

THE WISCONSIN SCHOOL EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

The Wisconsin School Evaluation Consortium, which developed as a result of a fiscal crisis impacting the Wisconsin North Central Association, is a concrete example of LEA/ University cooperation. The UW-Madison and the member schools jointly fund the program, which exists to provide schools and school districts with assistance in the development and management of theoretically sound and practical approaches to program evaluation.

The purpose of the Consortium is to create a voluntary, cooperative, and effective approach to school evaluation which has a fiscal base sufficient for it to perform its set of functions. While the Consortium is only three-and-one-half months old, the response of Wisconsin schools to it suggests that it may be an idea whose time has come.

ARIZONA

A developing program of coordinating university researchers who wish to conduct research in Maricopa County Schools--matching district research priorities with persons who want to/must conduct research.

Mesa Public Schools--The development of a student drug survey in conjunction with Arizona State University.

CALIFORNIA

A joint Teacher Corps Project--San Jose State University and and Alum Rock School District in San Jose, California.

II. Method

Description of the Subjects

Three populations were surveyed. Population one consisted of 100 Directors of Research and Evaluation (DRE) in large cities who belong to an organized group entitled Large City Directors of Research and Evaluation.

Members of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Division H comprised the second population. This population was further subdivided into six groups based on where respondents were employed. The employment areas were Local Education Agency (LEA); State Education Agency (SEA); University; College; Research, Development, and Evaluation Organization (RD&E); and Other.

Included in population three were 40 Deans of American Colleges of Education.

Instruments

Two questionnaires were developed by the principal investigators with input from Task Force members. One questionnaire was sent to AERA Division H members and Large City DREs, the other was sent to Deans of Colleges of Education.

The purpose of the questionnaires was to obtain census data, organizational data, survey the state of University/Local Education Agency Research and Evaluation relations and obtain information on how to improve and expand those relationships for the benefit of both groups.

Each questionnaire was piloted and revised. The Dean's questionnaire was mailed after its first revision. The second instrument was sent after three revisions. In addition to the piloting, members of the Division H Task Force had input on the questionnaire design.

Procedure

Subject Selection. The entire population of Large City DREs was chosen for the survey. The 100 members included representation from the United States and Canada.

At the time of the mailing of the questionnaire, there were approximately 3,700 members of AERA Division H. Fifty percent of this membership was randomly selected for a total of approximately 1,800 possible participants. This population included representation from the United States, Canada, and Guam.

Based on proximity to a large (above 24,000 students) school district, 40 Deans of Colleges of Education were selected from the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges mailing list.

Instrument. Questionnaire #1 was designed for Division H members and DREs. It was designed using information from Division H Task Force members, papers from previous AERA meetings which touched on the subject, and some information from a literature review. Questionnaire #1 was piloted by 22 research and evaluation personnel. In addition, several members of the Division H Task Force on "Fostering Fruitful University/LEA Relationships" gave input on the design and content of this questionnaire. For the DRE population, the questionnaire was mailed directly to each. A stamped return envelope was also included. The Division H members received their questionnaires in the October mailing of the Division newsletter.

Questionnaire #2 was sent to Deans of Colleges of Education after one revision by a committee of Research and Evaluation personnel. Its final form was piloted by an Assistant Dean for Research in a college of education. This questionnaire was a modification of the questionnaire sent to Division H and DREs.

III. Results

Introduction

Table 1 shows the response rate from DRE and Division H members. In addition, three DRE members who have curtailed outside research and evaluation in their districts responded to the open-ended part of the questionnaire only. An additional DRE response and five university responses were returned after the deadline. Because of the size of the sample, SEA, RD&E and others were excluded from the data analysis.

There was a 60 percent response rate from the Deans of Colleges of Education with one mailing.

Statistical Tools

Because of the use of discrete variables producing only nominal data, the following statistics were applied:

1. One-way frequency distributions.
2. Chi-square test of statistical significance was used to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables.
3. The Cramers V, a slightly modified version of phi which is suitable for larger tables.
4. Phi is a statistic which is a suitable measure of association for a 2x2 table.
5. Fisher's Exact Test for 2x2 Tables where the N is small. It gives exact rather than approximate probabilities.

Analysis of Data

Questionnaire #1 Division H and Large City Research Directors (CENSUS DATA)

#2. *Name of state in which you work.*

All states represented in the survey except Idaho, Maine, Montana,

North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Washington. Also included are Washington, D.C., Guam, and Canada.

#3. 1.____Male 2.____Female

The average respondent was an Anglo (all others) male with an earned Doctorate. Seventy-four percent of the responses were from the male population. A further breakdown by group membership is shown in Table 2. An analysis indicates that the most substantial portion of female respondents belongs to the university membership. Forty-one percent of the female respondents were university personnel. However, the total university female membership represented constituted only 26 percent of the total university respondents. Thirteen percent of all female respondents were DREs. Eighty-five percent of the DREs who responded were male. One quarter of the respondents who were part of the LEA staff membership (does not include DRE) were female.

#4. Highest degree obtained.

Eighty percent of the respondents have Doctorates, 16 percent have Master's only, and 1 percent have Bachelor Degrees. Of all Doctorates, 21 percent were DREs, 16 percent LEA staff and 46 percent university personnel. Table 3 depicts the educational attainment of all respondents.

#5. Ethnic origin

Ninety-four percent of all respondents were Anglo (all others), 1 percent Spanish, 3 percent Asian, 2 percent Black and less than 1 percent Native American. The results of this analysis by ethnic response percentages closely correspond to the AERA ethnic membership as reported in the 1979 Annual Report. Minorities constituted 5 percent of the total university response and 11 percent of the combined DRE and LEA staff response.

#6. Indicate where you presently work.

Table 4 is a tabulation of all respondents by group membership based on where they presently work. A number of the respondents divide their time among two agencies and are therefore part of more than one group membership.

#7. Indicate where you worked previously.

The tabulation of the past work place of the respondents (Table 5) shows that although the majority (45 percent) of the DREs worked in LEAs previous to the present position, 36 percent have some higher education work experience. Concomitantly 28 percent of the higher education respondents worked previously in an LEA.

#8. If higher education, what is student enrollment?

The majority (49 percent) of the higher education respondents work in schools with a student enrollment of 25,000-44,999, 16 percent below 10,000, and 9 percent above 45,000.

#9. If LEA, what is student enrollment?

Fifty-eight percent of LEA respondents were from large city school districts. Only 9 percent were school districts with enrollments below 10,000. The remaining 33 percent was divided fairly evenly between categories two and three.

#10. Position function.

Twenty-nine percent of respondents were RD&E Directors, 27 percent higher education personnel and 26 percent were of the other category.

(ORGANIZATIONAL DATA LEA)

#11. Do you have a centralized research and evaluation (R&E) unit?

Yes - 80 percent No - 20 percent

#12. If yes, number of total staff in R&E unit.

Forty-four percent of LEA total group membership responded that their school district Research and Evaluation unit had been in existence longer than ten years. Table 6 shows response frequencies. The Lyons' study for the Center for the Study of Evaluation found that most evaluation offices were established after 1965.

#13. If yes, number of total staff in R&E unit.

Thirty-two percent of respondents indicated Research and Evaluation staff size of one to four. A slightly smaller percentage, 29 percent, indicated staff size of more than 15. Twenty-three percent indicated staff size of five to ten, 16 percent indicated staff size of 11-15.

#14. - #17. Eliminated

(UNIVERSITY ONLY)

#18. Name of department.

A variety of departments responded. Some include:

Elementary Education	Guidance	Psychology
Educational Psychology	Medical Education	Physical Education
Educational Administration	Educational Foundation	Home Economics
Special Education	Science Education	Higher Education
Educational Research and Evaluation	Adult Education	Reading
	Minorities Studies	

#19. Do you have a coordinating research office (CRO)?

Most have some type of CRO. Yes - 73 percent No - 27 percent

#20. If yes, check all that apply.

Department level CRO - 19 percent
College level CRO - 56 percent
University level CRO - 75 percent

> Some have more than one type.

#21. Eliminated

#22. Number of four-year colleges within metropolitan area.

The majority of respondents live in an area where there are three or more four-year colleges.

None - 24 percent

One to two - 22 percent

Three or more - 54 percent

#23. Number of universities within metropolitan area.

The majority of respondents live in an area where there are one to two universities.

None - 18 percent

One to two - 43 percent

Three or more - 39 percent

#24. If you request outside RD&E, from whom do you request assistance?

Table 7 is a cross-tabulation by respondents' group membership. The analysis indicates that when DREs requested outside assistance in Research and Evaluation, 70 percent of the time they requested it from universities. Consultants were utilized 54 percent of the time. Conversely, universities requested assistance from other universities 50 percent of the time while utilizing LEAs only 22 percent of the time. Requests to consultants from higher education represent 39 percent. Sixty percent of the respondents who indicated no cooperative projects were university personnel. Seventeen percent of all respondents indicated they have requested assistance from LEA, while 91 percent have requested assistance from higher education.

#25. Who requests to work with you on RD&E?

Represented in Table 8 is a cross-tabulation of the responses. LEAs receive the majority of their requests from the university (51 percent).

Forty-six of the respondents indicated that LEAs have requested to work with them. According to the responses, higher education gets requests for RD&E respectively from DRE and other higher education institutions. Sixty-one percent indicated that universities have requested to work with them. Most of them were other universities. Thirty percent of the higher education and LEA respondents indicated no cooperative projects.

#26. Person(s) responsible for final approval of research requests.

In the LEA, final authorization for RD&E is given either by the Superintendent (80 percent) or the RD&E Director (78 percent). There are some differences in the responses of DREs and LEA staff. The former responded that final approval is given by the Superintendent only 24 percent of the time, while the latter indicated 57 percent of the time. This discrepancy indicates LEA staff may be unaware of the district policy. In the higher education setting 50 percent of the time when final approval is given, it is given by a dean.

(PROBLEMS AND ISSUES - HOW IT IS AND HOW IT SHOULD BE)

The data presented are only for those variables on which the chi-square was significant for at least one of the three group memberships being analyzed.

#27. There is early, cooperative involvement of both groups in planning the research effort.

**<u>DREs</u> - 87% frequently or always should be
70% rarely or sometimes is

<u>LEAs</u> - 86% frequently or always should be
57% rarely or never is

<u>Univ</u> - 89% frequently or always should be
71% rarely or sometimes is

Narrative: A significant majority of all three group memberships agree that this is a variable which should be part of research and evaluation relationships.

**Significant at the .05 level

#28. *Decisionmaking and power is shared equally by the resource controllers and those affected by the effort.*

DREs - 70% frequently or always should be
67% rarely or sometimes is

LEAs - 70% frequently or always should be
76% rarely or sometimes is

**Univ - 81% frequently or always should be
76% rarely or sometimes is

Narrative: The majority agree that this variable is not consistently occurring in University/LEA Research and Evaluation relationships, but it should be. University personnel appear to be the most concerned.

#30. *Policies and procedures are clearly defined.*

DREs - 96% frequently or always should be
69% sometimes or frequently is

**LEAs - 95% frequently or always should be
57% sometimes or frequently is

Univ - 94% frequently or always should be
68% sometimes or frequently is

Narrative: All three group memberships agree that this variable should occur more frequently, but that it does presently occur with some regularity.

#35. *Division H awards program includes the category "Best Example of a Collaborative University/LEA Effort."*

**DREs - 70% frequently or sometimes should be
74% never or rarely is

LEAs - 76% frequently or always should be
50% never is

Univ - 75% frequently or always should be
46% sometimes is
29% never is

Narrative: Although all three memberships appear to want such an award, there is some discrepancy as to what the present state is.

**Significant at the .05 level

#36. Research journals are encouraged to develop special issues on this subject of University/LEA relations and maintain it as an editorial priority.

**DREs - 76% frequently or sometimes should be
79% never or rarely is

LEAs - 82% frequently or sometimes should be
81% never or rarely is

**Univ - 65% frequently or sometimes should be
81% never or rarely is

Narrative: The majority of all three groups indicate that journals are not encouraging collaborative research, but they should sometimes focus on issues involving collaborative research.

#37. University research is based on LEA needs.

DREs - 53% frequently should be
61% rarely is

LEAs - 64% frequently should be
47% rarely is
31% sometimes is

**Univ - 81% frequently or sometimes should be
56% sometimes is

Narrative: All groups agree that university research should be based to some extent on LEA needs. The combined LEA group feels it should be more frequent. Interestingly, the university personnel feel that it is occurring more frequently than do the LEA personnel.

#38. University research is based on university needs.

DREs - 48% sometimes should be
54% frequently is

LEAs - 51% sometimes should be
53% frequently is

**Univ - 47% sometimes should be
41% frequently should be
45% sometimes is
35% frequently is

**Significant at the .05 level

Narrative: Although there does not appear to be wide discrepancy among the groups on this variable, responses indicate that the university personnel perceive a closer match between how it is and how it should be than LEA personnel.

#39. Univereity research is based on joint needs.

DREs - 50% frequently should be
55% rarely is

LEAs - 53% frequently should be
39% rarely is
37% sometimes is

**Univ - 37% sometimes should be
44% frequently should be
58% sometimes is

Narrative: University personnel feel that research is more often based on joint needs than LEA personnel. Significant discrepancy between DRE responses and university responses on how it is.

#40. Research conducted by univereity is of value to LEA.

DREs - 59% frequently should be
43% rarely is
46% sometimes is

LEAs - 70% frequently should be
60% sometimes is

**Univ - 53% frequently should be
57% sometimes is

Narrative: All agree that university research should be of value to the LEA more frequently. DREs perceive this as occurring less than the other two group memberships.

#41. Research conducted by LEA is of value to univereity.

**DREs - 48% sometimes should be
44% frequently should be
42% rarely is
42% sometimes is

**Signigicant at the .05 level

**LEAs - 47% sometimes should be
43% frequently should be
29% rarely is
49% sometimes is

**Univ - 46% sometimes should be
42% frequently should be
49% rarely is
32% sometimes is

Narrative: These data present some interesting questions. Less than 10 percent of the respondents in each membership indicated that it always is or always should. The question is, "If university research is not of value to LEA or to the university, then to whom is it of value?"

#42. A compilation of LEA research needs is available to university and others.

**DREs - 43% frequently should be
31% always should be
36% rarely is
25% sometimes is

LEAs - 49% frequently should be
29% always should be
29% never is
37% rarely is

Univ - 55% frequently should be
30% always should be
57% rarely is
21% never is

Narrative: Strong indication that these three groups favor compilation of LEA research but it is not presently available. DREs feel it is more available than LEA and university staff.

#43. LEA has a policy/procedure for out-of-district research.

**DREs - 83% always should be
67% always is
25% frequently is

**LEAs - 68% always should be
48% always is
40% rarely or never is

**Significant at the .05 level

**Univ - 47% always should be
31% frequently should be
17% always is
22% rarely is
26% sometimes is
24% frequently is

Narrative: Most LEA and DRE respondents indicate that most often the LEA has a policy on out-of-district research. However, university personnel do not concur.

#44. LEA Data Base Information is available.

**DREs - 38% always should be
28% frequently should be
33% sometimes is
23% frequently is

**LEAs - 40% always should be
32% frequently should be
30% rarely is
24% sometimes is

Univ - 40% always or frequently should be
47% rarely is
21% sometimes is

Narrative: The majority of each group membership concur that there should be a compilation of LEA Data Base Information, but strong preferences are not indicated in any one direction.

#45. Univeraity Data Base Information is available.

DREs - 31% sometimes is
35% sometimes should be
37% rarely is
27% frequently should be
27% never is
27% always should be

**LEAs - 37% sometimes is
37% sometimes should be
44% frequently should be
48% never or rarely is

**Univ 33% rarely is
35% sometimes is
44% frequently should be
35% always should be

**Significant at the .05 level

Narrative: Responses of university personnel indicate that this group feels more strongly about the availability of University Data Base Information. This observation is in line with previous analyses which indicate that universities would tend to use University Data Base more so than LEAs.

#46. Cooperative Data Bases have been developed.

**DREs - 57% never is
33% rarely is
38% sometimes should be
31% frequently should be

LEAs - 59% never is
24% rarely is
43% sometimes should be
29% frequently should be

Univ - 38% never is
44% rarely is
32% sometimes should be
42% frequently should be

Narrative: Close agreement that there are few Cooperative Data Bases, but most respondents feel there should. University personnel responses indicate this more strongly than LEAs or DREs.

#47. Knowledge and resources have been pooled in an attempt to solve metropolitan educational problems.

**DREs - 54% rarely is
43% frequently should be

LEAs - 39% rarely is
50% frequently should be

Univ - 44% rarely is
59% frequently should be

Narrative: The majority of all three-group memberships indicates that this is an area which has been remiss but which should frequently occur.

#49. There is a designated person(s) in LEA office who handles out-of-district research requests.

**DREs - 87% always should be
72% always is

**Significant at the .05 level

**LEAs - 82% always should be
62% always is

**Univ 54% always should be
29% always is

Narrative: LEAs and DREs appear to be in close agreement on this variable. LEAs usually have a designated person. According to their responses, although this usually occurs, it should occur more frequently. University respondents, however, don't feel as strongly as the former on how it should be. There is a discrepancy in how the LEA groups and the university group perceive the present situation.

#50. Human subject form(s) is required for appropriate research projects.

**DREs - 64% always should be
51% always is

**LEAs - 64% always should be
52% always is

**Univ - 77% always should be
70% always is

Narrative: There is a close match between (inter and intra) group's perceptions of how it is and how it ideally should be.

#51. The Consortium or formal relationship between participating organizations with specific guidelines established in advance.

DREs - 40% rarely is
35% frequently should be

LEAs - 44% never is
44% frequently should be

**Univ - 43% sometimes is
44% frequently should be

Narrative: University personnel responses appear to indicate that they utilize or encounter the consortium approach more than LEA and DRE respondents. All indicate that the approach should be utilized more than it is.

**Significant at the .05 level

#52. *Informal Relationships resulting from personal relationships.*

**DREs - 32% sometimes is
41% frequently is
32% sometimes should be
39% frequently should be

**LEAs - 43% sometimes is
30% frequently is
34% sometimes should be
45% frequently should be

**Univ - 28% sometimes is
57% frequently is
30% sometimes should be
50% frequently should be

Narrative: The DRE group appears most satisfied with the status quo. The LEA group indicates more uses of informal relationships, while university responses tend toward a little less frequent use.

#53. *Personnel Exchange where LEA and univeresity personnel are shared or exchanged for periods of time.*

**DREs - 41% never is
37% rarely is
51% sometimes should be
39% frequently should be

LEAs - 61% never is
27% rarely is
56% sometimes should be
25% frequently should be

**Univ - 43% rarely is
26% sometimes is
43% sometimes should be
43% frequently should be

Narrative: There is agreement among the groups on the present state of the art. The three memberships concur that personnel exchange should be utilized at least sometimes. More DRE and university respondents indicated that personnel exchange should frequently occur than was indicated by the LEA respondents.

#54. *Solicited Cooperatives where university and labs are apprised of topics which LEAs would be interested in pursuing.*

**DREs - 42% rarely is
44% frequently should be

**Significant at the .05 level

LEAs - 35% never is
44% rarely is
30% sometimes should be
54% frequently should be

Univ - 41% rarely is
38% sometimes is
59% frequently should be

Narrative: The majority of each membership indicated that solicited cooperatives are rare. Some university respondents indicated that they do sometimes occur. A greater percentage of LEA and university personnel than DRE respondents indicated a preference for frequent occurence.

(PRIORITIZE)

Note: This section is in need of further analyses. The two programs that have been run have not yielded good data. The principal investigators would like to run another program prior to the AERA Conference. Suggestions are invited.

Table 9 lists the average ranking by group membership on Variables #57-#64. Variable #65 was eliminated because of the limited number of responses to it.

Table 10 depicts the nature of University/LEA relationships based on how LEA staff, Large City Directors of Research and Evaluation and Higher Education Respondents perceive "who plans and initiates" certain relationships.

Table 11 is a composite of the responses by the above-mentioned groups regarding "who manages and controls."

Table 9. Average Ranking by Group Membership on Variables #57-#64.

	Variable	DRE	LEA	Higher Education
#57.	*Preservice education.*	4.0 (4)*	3.5 (3)*	3.2 (1)*
#58.	*Provision of field sites; supervision or practicums.*	2.8 (1)*	2.4 (1)*	4.2 (4)*
#59.	*Staff development and inservice education.*	3.1 (2)*	3.2 (2)*	3.3 (2)*
#60.	*Consultation and other direct services.*	3.3 (3)*	3.5 (3)*	3.3 (2)*
#61.	*Creation and communication of research.*	4.9 (6)*	4.9 (6)*	4.2 (4)*
#62.	*Development of results.*	5.9 (8)*	5.9 (8)*	5.1 (6)*
#63.	*Provision of RD&E subjects and participants.*	4.1 (5)*	4.7 (5)*	5.9 (7)*
#64.	*College and university preparatory education.*	5.3 (7)*	5.5 (7)*	4.7 (8)*

*Rank order of the average ranks.

Narrative: The priority rankings of the DRE and LEA staff vary only slightly and on only one variable. The higher education rankings vary from the LEA groups only slightly except on Variables #57 and #58. Most of the rankings are in line with expectations with one exception. In the open-ended questions, LEA and DRE respondents have consistently listed one of their chief complaints as, universities' view of them as a laboratory full of subjects. It was therefore expected that Variable #63, provision of RD&E subjects and participants, would have received a higher priority.

Table 10. Who Plans and Initiates (Based on All Respondents)?

	Variable	University	LEA	Both
#66.	*Preservice education.*	74%	18%	8%
#67.	*Provision of field sites; supervision or practicums.*	61%	19%	20%
#68.	*Staff development and inservice education.*	12%	63%	25%
#69.	*Consultation and other direct services.*	22%	60%	20%
#70.	*Creation and communication of research.*	48%	20%	32%
#71.	*Development of results.*	53%	24%	23%
#72.	*Provision of RD&E subjects and participants.*	41%	38%	21%
#73.	*College and university preparatory education.*	73%	20%	7%
*#74.	*Other*_____	36%	29%	36%

*Limited number responding

Table 11. Who Manages and Controls (Based on All Respondents)?

	Variable	University	LEA	Both
#75.	*Preservice education.*	71%	17%	12%
#76.	*Provision of field sites; supervision or practicums.*	40%	38%	22%
#77.	*Staff development and inservice education.*	15%	63%	22%
#78.	*Consultation and other direct services.*	27%	53%	20%
#79.	*Creation and communication of research.*	47%	21%	33%
#80.	*Development of results.*	45%	28%	27%
#81.	*Provision of RD&E subjects and participants.*	14%	61%	24%
#82.	*College and university preparatory education.*	71%	21%	8%
*#83.	*Other*_____	17%	42%	42%

*Limited number responding

Narrative: These results indicate that there is little joint planning or managing between higher education and local education agencies. Planning and initiating is controlled by the university in all areas except staff development and inservice education (Item #59) and consultation and other direct services (Item #60).

On the management and controlling variable, the same pattern is indicated. However, a significant portion (61 percent) of the respondents replied that the LEA manages and controls the provision of RD&E subjects (Item #63).

#84. Did you engage in any joint University/LEA proposals for funding in the last three years?

One hundred of the respondents who answered this question responded in the affirmative. Fifty-one percent of them were university personnel, 15 percent were LEA, and 24 percent were DREs.

#86. Were any of the proposals funded?

Twenty-six percent of the DREs who responded, 15 percent of the LEAs and 51 percent of the university personnel indicated that they did have funded proposals.

Note: All open-ended questions are in the process of being analyzed; more discussion will be included in Denise Richardson's dissertation.

Questionnaire #2 Deans of Colleges of Education

#1. Name of state in which you work.

Respondents represented a cross section of 15 states.

#2. 1.____Male 2.____Female

#3. Ethnic Origin

The sample was comprised of 21 males, 18 Anglo (all others), three Asian Americans, two Black Americans, and three Anglo (all others) females.

#4. What is the student enrollment of your institution?

The majority (79%) of the deans who responded were from higher education institutions with a student enrollment between 10,000 and 44,999.

#5. What is graduate student enrollment in College of Education?

The graduate student enrollment ranged from 350-5,000 students. The modal range was 700-1,100.

#6. Approximate number of faculty conducting research in LEAs annually?

The faculty ranged from 6-50. The modal range was 11-20. The mode was 20.

#7. Do you have a coordinating research office(s) (CRO)?

Yes - 68% No - 32%

#8. If yes, check all that apply.

Department Level CRO - 14 percent

College Level CRO - 36 percent

University Level CRO - 50 percent

#9. Who is responsible for final approval of graduate research (check one)?

Major Advisor - 46 percent

Department Head - 18 percent

Dean (or Assistant) - 36 percent

Other - 24 percent (Includes faculty and human subject research committees.)

Narrative: These results differ from Division H responses. Division H respondents indicated that deans most often gave final approval for research. The dean's responses indicate that in most cases it is the major advisor.

#10. Does College of Education have a research policy?

Yes - 52 percent No - 48 percent

The following approaches to cooperative research are used:

#17. <u>The Consortium</u> or formal relationship between participating organizations with specific guidelines established in advance.

Yes - 58 percent No - 42 percent

#18. <u>Informal Relationships</u> resulting from personal relationships.

Yes - 91 percent No - 9 percent

#19. <u>Personnel Exchange</u> where LEA and University personnel are shared or exchanged for periods of time.

Yes - 39 percent No - 61 percent

#20. <u>Solicited Cooperatives</u> where the University is apprised of topics which LEAs would be interested in pursuing.

Yes - 67 percent No - 33 percent

IV. Conclusion

When reviewing comments about problems in the relationship, they range from "no problems" to "schools (LEAs) get nothing in return for their cooperation." Time complaints were frequent, such as "length of time necessary for approval process" and "too many surveys requiring teacher's time to answer." "Lack of clearly defined roles of each party" and "neither recognizes that each has a differing set of expectations about the purposes/benefits of research."

Respondents from Local Education Agencies think university researchers are too theoretical and university personnel resent having to adhere to district approval procedures. University personnel have been described variously as arrogant and elitist" . . . "aloof and arcane" and "seeking to impress fellow professionals" while the local school system personnel are "searching for solutions" and see "little or no actual return . . . as an outcome of their involvement." "Local schools mistrust use of results" but also mentioned was "failure to provide feedback on results (of research) and recommendations."

Creative comments to foster better relationships included:

"Loan a faculty person to the LEA"

"Joint planning"

"Joint sponsorship to research and evaluation topics"

"Careful monitoring of proposals at the university level"

"Collaborate to develop guidelines"

and many more which include cooperative planning in developing projects through conducting them. Many LEA persons felt feedback was poor and also not relevant. Both LEA and university respondents indicated an interest in cooperative ventures.

It must be noted that Division H members who took time to answer the questionnaire may be more interested in cooperative research than those who failed to respond. For the relatively few persons who made disparaging remarks about the questionnaire instrument, the authors agree it was long. Several Task Force committee members reviewed a draft of the instrument and were asked to delete irrelevant questions. This process had the opposite effect and generated more questions.

A high percentage of respondents included their names and addresses and indicated they would like a report of the results or would be willing to be interviewed by phone. Cursory analysis of a series of statements designed to elicit both "How It Is" and "How It Should Be" (i.e., *Question #48. Information is shared concerning ongoing activities.*) also suggest there are gaps in communication between LEAs and Universities which need attention.

Tabulated results of responses reported in this paper indicate that recommendations made last year by Walter Hathaway, Chairperson of the Division H Task Force, were sound. There is a pattern of agreement which supports thinking that the time is ripe for strengthening and increasing all phases of University/LEA cooperative relationships. The authors of this paper will work with other Task Force members to further analyze the aggregated data, and suggest an action agenda for the future.

Table 1

VARIABLE GROUP RESPONDENT'S GROUP MEMBERSHIP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	COUNT	% OF RESPONSES	% OF CASES
DRE	1	67	22.1	22.1
DIVISION H LEA	2	59	19.5	19.5
DIVISION H RDLE	3	19	6.3	6.3
DIVISION H SEA	4	12	4.0	4.0
DIVISION H OTHER	5	24	7.9	7.9
DIVISION H UNIVERSIT	6	122	40.3	40.3
	TOTAL RESPONSES	303	100.0	100.0

0 MISSING CASES 303 VALID CASES

Table 2

SEX	COUNT / ROW % / COL %	GROUP: DRE 1	DIVISION H LEA 2	DIVISION H RDLE 3	DIVISION H SEA 4	DIVISION H OTHER 5	DIVISION H UNIVERSIT 6	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1	55	44	14	8	12	89	222
		24.8	19.8	6.3	3.6	5.4	40.1	74.0
		84.6	74.6	73.7	66.7	50.0	73.6	
FEMALE	2	10	15	5	4	12	32	78
		12.8	19.2	6.4	5.1	15.4	41.0	26.0
		15.4	25.4	26.3	33.3	50.0	26.4	
COLUMN TOTAL		65	59	19	12	24	121	300
		21.7	19.7	6.3	4.0	8.0	40.3	100.0

PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

300 VALID CASES 3 MISSING CASES

Table 3

GROUP

DEGREE	COUNT / ROW % / COL %	CORE	DIVISION H LEA	DIVISION H RDLE	DIVISION H SEA	DIVISION H OTHER	DIVISION H UNIVE PSIT	ROW TOTAL
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
BACHELORS	1	1 25.0 1.5	2 50.0 3.4	0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0	1 25.0 0.8	4 1.3
MASTERS	2	11 23.4 16.9	16 34.0 27.1	3 6.4 15.8	3 6.4 25.0	6 12.8 25.0	8 17.0 6.6	47 15.7
DOCTORATE	3	51 21.3 78.5	39 16.3 66.1	14 5.8 73.7	8 3.3 66.7	16 6.7 66.7	112 46.7 92.6	240 80.0
OTHER	4	2 22.2 3.1	2 22.2 3.4	2 22.2 10.5	1 11.1 8.3	2 22.2 8.3	0 0.0 0.0	9 3.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	65 21.7	59 19.7	19 6.3	12 4.0	24 8.0	121 40.3	300 100.0

PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

300 VALID CASES 3 MISSING CASES

Table 4

WORK	GROUP / COUNT / ROW % / COL %	PRE	DIVISION H LEA	DIVISION H ROLE	DIVISION H SEA	DIVISION H OTHER	DIVISION H UNIVERSITY	ROW TOTAL
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
WORK FOR LEA	WORKNOW1	65	59	0	0	0	0	124
		52.4	47.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.3
		100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
WORK FOR SEA	WORKNOW2	0	1	0	12	0	3	16
		0.0	6.3	0.0	75.0	0.0	18.8	5.3
		0.0	1.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	2.5	
WORK FOR UNIVERSITY	WORKNOW3	1	2	0	0	0	107	110
		0.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	97.3	36.7
		1.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.4	
WORK FOR COLLEGE	WORKNOW4	1	0	0	0	0	11	12
		8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.7	4.0
		1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	
WORK FOR ROLE ORGANI	WORKNOW5	0	0	19	0	0	3	42
		0.0	0.0	86.4	0.0	0.0	13.6	7.3
		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	
OTHER	WORKNOW6	1	2	0	0	24	4	31
		3.2	6.5	0.0	0.0	77.4	12.9	10.3
		1.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	65	59	19	12	24	121	300
		21.7	19.7	6.3	4.0	8.0	40.3	100.0

PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

300 VALID CASES 3 MISSING CASES

Table 5

WORKPAST	GROUP	DIVISION H LEA	DIVISION H RDLE	DIVISION H SEA	DIVISION H OTHER	DIVISION H UNIVERSIT	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT / ROW % / COL %	1	2	3	4	5	6	
LEA	1	19 / 22.1 / 45.2	23 / 26.7 / 52.3	4 / 4.7 / 22.2	4 / 4.7 / 33.3	5 / 5.8 / 21.7	31 / 36.0 / 28.4	86 / 34.7
SEA	2	1 / 16.7 / 2.4	1 / 16.7 / 2.3	0 / 0.0 / 0.0	0 / 0.0 / 0.0	1 / 16.7 / 4.3	3 / 50.0 / 2.8	6 / 2.4
UNIVERSITY	3	15 / 15.8 / 35.7	9 / 9.5 / 20.5	7 / 7.4 / 38.9	4 / 4.2 / 33.3	9 / 9.5 / 39.1	51 / 53.7 / 46.8	95 / 38.3
COLLEGE	4	1 / 7.1 / 2.4	0 / 0.0 / 0.0	2 / 14.3 / 11.1	1 / 7.1 / 8.3	4 / 28.6 / 17.4	6 / 42.9 / 5.5	14 / 5.6
RDLE ORGANIZATION	5	0 / 0.0 / 0.0	2 / 16.7 / 4.5	3 / 16.7 / 11.1	2 / 16.7 / 16.7	0 / 0.0 / 0.0	6 / 50.0 / 5.5	12 / 4.8
OTHER	6	6 / 17.1 / 14.3	9 / 25.7 / 20.5	3 / 8.6 / 16.7	1 / 2.9 / 8.3	4 / 11.4 / 17.4	12 / 34.3 / 11.0	35 / 14.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	42 / 16.9	44 / 17.7	18 / 7.3	12 / 4.8	23 / 9.3	109 / 44.0	248 / 100.0

PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

248 VALID CASES 55 MISSING CASES

Table 6

VARIABLE ITEM12 AGE OF RLE UNIT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	COUNT	% OF RESPONSES	% OF CASES
LESS THAN 1 YEAR	1	7	6.4	6.4
1-5 YEARS	2	21	19.1	19.1
5-10 YEARS	3	34	30.9	30.9
MORE THAN 10 YEARS	4	48	43.6	43.6
	TOTAL RESPONSES	110	100.0	100.0

193 MISSING CASES 110 VALID CASES

Table 7

EQUEST	COUNT / ROW % / COL %	GROUP: DRE (1)	DIVISION H LEA (2)	DIVISION H RDLE (3)	DIVISION H SEA (4)	DIVISION H OTHER (5)	DIVISION H UNIVERSIT (6)	ROW TOTAL
ASSISTANCE FROM LEA	LEA24	9	4	2	3	2	18	38
		23.7	10.5	5.3	7.9	5.3	47.4	17.4
		16.1	9.3	16.7	25.0	13.3	22.2	
ASSISTANCE FROM SEA	SEA24	15	8	4	1	3	24	53
		28.3	15.1	7.5	1.9	5.7	45.3	24.2
		26.8	18.6	33.3	8.3	20.0	29.6	
ASSISTANCE FROM UNIV	UNIV24	39	29	4	11	10	40	133
		29.3	21.8	3.0	8.3	7.5	30.1	60.7
		69.6	67.4	33.3	91.7	66.7	49.4	
ASSISTANCE FROM COLL	COLL24	7	2	1	3	3	11	27
		25.9	7.4	3.7	11.1	11.1	40.7	12.3
		12.5	4.7	8.3	25.0	20.0	13.6	
ASSISTANCE FROM RDLE	RDE24	21	13	2	8	5	17	66
		31.8	19.7	3.0	12.1	7.6	25.8	30.1
		37.5	30.2	16.7	66.7	33.3	21.0	
ASSISTANCE FROM CONS	CONSUL24	30	19	10	6	8	32	105
		28.6	18.1	9.5	5.7	7.6	30.5	47.9
		53.6	44.2	83.3	50.0	53.3	39.5	
NO COOPERATIVE PROJE	NOCOOP24	4	3	0	0	0	10	17
		23.5	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.8	7.8
		7.1	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	
ASSISTANCE FROM OTHE	OTHER24	6	1	0	2	5	6	20
		30.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	30.0	9.1
		10.7	2.3	0.0	16.7	33.3	7.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	56	43	12	12	15	81	219
		25.6	19.6	5.5	5.5	6.8	37.0	100.0

PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

219 VALID CASES 84 MISSING CASES

Table 8

WORKWITH	GROUP: COUNT / ROW % / COL %	DIVISION H LEA (1)	DIVISION H RDBE (2)	DIVISION H SEA (3)	DIVISION H OTHER (4)	DIVISION H UNIVERSIT (5)	ROW TOTAL
WORK WITH LEA	LEA25	18	12	12	5	7	57	111
		16.2	10.8	10.8	4.5	6.3	51.4	45.9
		30.5	27.9	66.7	45.5	43.8	60.0	
WORK WITH SEA	SEA25	32	14	13	0	4	41	104
		30.8	13.5	12.5	0.0	3.8	39.4	43.0
		54.2	32.6	72.2	0.0	25.0	43.2	
WORK WITH UNIVERSITY	UNIV25	52	27	8	7	8	45	147
		35.4	18.4	5.4	4.8	5.4	30.6	60.7
		88.1	62.8	44.4	63.6	50.0	47.4	
WORK WITH COLLEGE	COLL25	27	9	7	2	5	26	76
		35.5	11.8	9.2	2.6	6.6	34.2	31.4
		45.8	20.9	38.9	18.2	31.3	27.4	
WORK WITH RDBE ORG	RDE25	30	10	10	4	5	26	85
		35.3	11.8	11.8	4.7	5.9	30.6	35.1
		50.8	23.3	55.6	36.4	31.3	27.4	
WORK WITH CONSULTANT	CONSUL25	26	10	8	1	8	26	79
		32.9	12.7	10.1	1.3	10.1	32.9	32.6
		44.1	23.3	44.4	9.1	50.0	27.4	
NO COOPERATIVE PROJE	NOCOOP25	4	7	1	1	1	7	23
		17.4	30.4	4.3	4.3	13.0	30.4	9.5
		6.8	16.3	5.6	9.1	18.8	7.4	
WORK WITH OTHER SOUR	OTHER25	10	6	4	3	1	17	43
		23.3	14.0	9.3	7.0	7.0	39.5	17.8
		16.9	14.0	22.2	27.3	18.8	17.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	59	43	18	11	16	95	242
		24.4	17.8	7.4	4.5	6.6	39.3	100.0

PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

242 VALID CASES 61 MISSING CASES